

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18

QAT Received 13/08/2018

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

Leeds Institute of Cardiovascular and Metabolic Medicine (LICAMM)
School of Medicine

Subject(s):

BSc Healthcare Science (Cardiac Physiology) MSc Advanced Practice

Programme(s) / Module(s):

ARCS1106, HECS2199, HECS2194, HECS2200, HECS2202, HECS2203, HECS2204,
HECS3077, HECS3264, ARCS3255, HECS3265, HECS3270.

ARCS5205M

Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):

BSc and MSc

Part B: Comments for the Institution on the Examination Process and Standards

Points of innovation and/or good practice

Please highlight areas of innovation or good practice within the programmes or processes you have been involved with in this box.

The Cardiology course team possess a wealth of clinical experience that greatly enhances this programme. The course is delivered to a high standard and the student support provided including comprehensive feedback is highly commended.

Enhancements made from the previous year

Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box.

None required

Matters for Urgent Attention

If there are any areas which you think require urgent attention before the programme is offered again please note them in this box

None

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

1.	Were you provided with an External Examiner Handbook?	N/A
2.	Were you provided with copies of previous External Examiners' reports and the School's responses to these?	N/A
3.	Were you provided with a External Examiner Mentor?	N/A

For Examiners completing their term of appointment

4.	Have you observed improvements in the programme(s) over the period of your appointment?	N/A
5.	Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made?	N/A
6.	Where recommendations have not been implemented, did the school provide clear reasons for this?	N/A
7.	Have you acted as an External Examiner Mentor?	N/A

Please comment on your experience of the programme(s) over the period of your appointment, remarking in particular on changes from year to year and the progressive development and enhancement of the learning and teaching provision, on standards achieved, on marking and assessment and the procedures of the School

N/A

Standards

8.	Is the overall programme structure coherent and appropriate for the level of study?	Y
9.	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met?	Y
10.	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?	Y
11.	Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?	Y
12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions?	Y
<p><i>Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.</i></p> <p>The structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes meet the requirements of the Modernising Scientific Careers Practitioner Training Programme BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science which are set by the National School of Healthcare Science (Health Education England).</p>		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
<p><i>Please explain how this is/could be achieved (examples might include: curriculum design informed by current research in the subject; practice informed by research; students undertaking research)</i></p> <p>The programme team are Lecturer Practitioners that undertake clinical practice to inform their subject knowledge and use current research to influence their teaching and learning. Student</p>		

research projects are relevant to the curriculum and can be used to influence future student learning.

14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
-----	--	---

Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:

N/A

15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	Y
-----	--	---

Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:

The placement portfolio / clinical practice module outcomes meet the requirements of the Modernising Scientific Careers Practitioner Training Programme BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science which are set by the National School of Healthcare Science (Health Education England). The programme team maintain high clinical standards and ensure their clinical practice is current. Competency assessments completed within clinical practice are internally verified and repeated within the University setting, however, documentation of the use of Observed Clinical Events (OCE) needs to be clear.

16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	Y
-----	--	---

Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:

The programme meets the requirements of the National School of Healthcare Science and the course hold current PSRB accreditation.

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
<p><i>Please comment on the assessment methods and the appropriateness of these to the ILOs, in particular: the design and structure of the assessment methods, and the arrangements for the marking of modules and the classification of awards; the quality of teaching, learning and assessment methods that may be indicated by student performance.</i></p> <p>All assessment methods are appropriate to the intended learning outcomes of each module. All marks awarded are consistent and appropriate to the work submitted and assessment brief. All feedback is constructive highlighting areas for improvement where applicable.</p>		
18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Y
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Y
<p><i>Please comment on the academic standards demonstrated by the students and, where possible, their performance in relation to students on comparable courses; the strengths and weaknesses of the students as a cohort:</i></p> <p>For the undergraduate programme the overall performance was very good with high academic standards demonstrated. Unfortunately the postgraduate performance was rather poor with evidence of the student's lack of critical analysis and independent thought. This was discussed with the module team and student support mechanisms are in place.</p>		
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i></p> <p>I would like to highly commend the course team for demonstrating excellent student support by their provision of very comprehensive electronic student feedback following submission of work.</p>		

--

The Progression and Awards Process

20.	Were you provided with guidance relating to the External Examiner's role, powers and responsibilities in the examination process?	Y
21.	Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner?	Y
22.	Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
23.	Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
24.	Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
25.	Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?	Y
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Y
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	Y
28.	Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?	Y
29.	Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?	Y

30.	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?	Y
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	Y
32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	Y
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p>		

Other comments

Please use this box if you wish to make any further comments not covered elsewhere on the form

Following a restructure within the administration team I found that this year was more organised and all work that was required to be seen was sent in a timely manner. Access to the VLE allows easy access to course material, electronic moderation of student work and verification of student feedback.

Part C: School Response to External Examiner Report

QAT Received 21/02/2019

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):	<i>Cardiac Physiology specialist modules</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	BSc (hons) Healthcare Science (Cardiac Physiology)
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	BSc

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:	Director of Student Education (Classified UG Programmes)
Faculty / School of:	<i>Faculty of Medicine and Health / School of Medicine</i>
Address for communication:	School of Medicine University of Leeds LEEDS LS29JT
Email:	
Telephone:	

**If the individual responding to the report is not the Head of School please state their position within the School.*

Completing the School response

Director of Student Education (Classified UG Programmes)

The completed School response (including the full original report) should be attached to an e-mail and sent to the Pro-Dean for Student Education in the relevant Faculty. Following approval by the Pro-Dean for Student Education, the School must send the response (including the full original report) directly to the External Examiner. A copy must also be emailed to the Quality Assurance Team at qat@leeds.ac.uk. External Examiners should receive a formal response no later than six weeks after receipt of the original report.

Response to Points of innovation and/or good practice

We appreciate the value placed on practising Cardiac Physiologist running the programme. We agree that this is an important factor in making our programme a success. We work hard to ensure that all feedback provided is relevant and will further inform future academic work.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

None required

Response to Matters for Urgent Attention

If any areas have been identified for urgent attention before the programme is offered again please provide a specific response to them here:

None required

Response to questions 1-7 (and related comments)

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

N/A

Standards

Response to questions 8 to 16 (and related comments)

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

We work closely with the National School of Healthcare Science to ensure that we continue to meet the required standards for our students to register on completion of the programme. We also work closely with our clinical partners and students to provide a “real life” experience for students when undertaking their research project modules, allowing them to explore clinical audits which are a part of the working practice of cardiac physiologists.

We appreciate the observation of our high clinical standards, which, I believe is a result of the team consisting of practicing Cardiac Physiologists. We will re-visit the documentation used for Observed Clinical Events, to ensure that this element is clearly visible in the practice profile.

Assessment and Feedback

Response to questions 17 to 19 (and related comments)

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

We are pleased that you feel our feedback is constructive and useful as this is not always reflect in student feedback. We do attempt to provide comprehensive useful feedback for our students, and spend a significant amount of time providing this.

The Progression and Awards Process

Response to questions 20-35 (and related comments)

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

We are pleased that you received the support and documentation you required to make an informed decision regarding progression and that the process to achieve this is fair and appropriate.

Other comments

Response to items included in the 'Other Comments' section of the report

After a difficult 2016/17 session with regards to admin support, I am glad that this year was more organised. We re-structured the admin support team and have a new member of staff and hope that this standard will be maintained.